

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 08632 121 1

3

Accessions

42 f. 526

Shelf No.

*7541. 223



Received. Mar. 15, 1859.

AN

APPEAL

TO

The Christian Public:

CONTAINING

THE DISCIPLINE OF THE TRINITARIAN CHURCH
IN CONCORD, MASS.

WITH

JOSEPH C. GREEN,

ALSO

HIS DEFENCE

Which he was not allowed to make before them.

“Doth our law judge any man before it hear him
and know what he doth?”.....*Nicodemus.*

Boston:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

.....
1828.

Pgh. v. 268

73.76.

427.526

Mar. 15. 1889

AN APPEAL, &c.

.....

To accuse a body of persons, bearing the character of a church of Christ, of tyranny and oppression, is a charge of such magnitude, that I really bring the accusation with fear and trembling. From this consideration I have been induced to make this appeal to the christian public, in which I shall lay before them the charges preferred against me, and the evidence given in support of the charges, and all the proceedings of the church, together with my own defence, which I have not been permitted to make before the church; that the public may be able to judge for themselves on this subject.

I am a native of the town of Concord, Mass. I was admitted to the fellowship of the church in this town, in June, 1818, in the twentieth year of my age. In December, 1825, I obtained a letter of recommendation to the church of Christ in Carlisle. In June, 1826 this letter was transmitted to an ecclesiastical council, convened in Concord, for the purpose of organizing a Trinitarian Church in this place, and myself and fifteen others were organized into a church of Christ, adopting generally the confession of faith and form of church government contained in the Cambridge Platform, assented to by the churches of New England, A. D. 1648, but more particularly the following articles of Faith and Church Covenant.*

PROFESSION OF FAITH.

Art. 1. You believe in the existence of one supreme and eternal God, infinite in wisdom, power, justice, truth, mercy, and goodness; the creator, preserver, proprietor and moral governor of the universe; subsisting in three persons, Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

* See Appendix, note A.

Art. 2. You believe that the moral law of God is perpetual, and that its precepts and sanctions can neither be annulled nor altered.

Art. 3. You believe that man is a rational and accountable agent: and that his accountability is neither destroyed nor diminished by his revolt from God.

Art. 4. You believe that the first parents of the human race were created upright and holy; that they revolted from God; and that in consequence all men are naturally destitute of holiness, alienated from God, sold under sin and lying under the righteous condemnation of God's law.

Art. 5. You believe in the essential deity of our Lord Jesus Christ; his manifestation in the flesh; and his mediation as the prophet, priest, and king of his ransomed people.

Art. 6. You believe that Jesus Christ gave himself a sacrifice for all men, honouring the violated law, and bringing in everlasting righteousness; thus making that atonement for sin, which man could never make for himself, without which God could not consistently pardon sin, and through which mercy is proffered to all.

Art. 7. You believe that penitent and believing sinners are freely and fully forgiven, are received into favour with God, and will never come into condemnation.

Art. 8. You believe that regeneration, or the renewal of the heart unto holiness, is effected by the special agency of the Holy Spirit; and that this grace is bestowed on those, who were given to Christ before the foundation of the world.

Art. 9. You believe that christians are kept by the power of God through faith, unto salvation; their hope and strength resting on the promise of God in his everlasting covenant.

Art. 10. You believe that a devoted life of new and holy obedience to the commands of God, is the necessary *fruit* and *evidence* of living faith.

Art. 11. You believe that the bodies of the righteous and the wicked will be raised up at the last day; that every man will give account to Christ; that the finally impenitent will be banished from God, and doomed to punishment which will never end, and that the ransomed of the Lord will be received to life eternal.

Art. 12. You believe that evidence of regeneration is necessary for admission to the church of Christ; that professors are bound to attend on public worship, baptism, and the Lord's supper with the church of which they are members, un-

til they are released by death, or by removal from the place, or by the consent of the church regularly obtained.

You believe *generally*, in the principles of faith and church government presented in the Cambridge Platform of Church Discipline, consented to by the Churches of New England, A. D. 1648.

CHURCH COVENANT.

Having been admitted by vote of this church as a candidate for their communion, and having made public profession of your faith, you now assume the bonds of the covenant in the presence of God, and before angels and men. Confessing and lamenting your multiplied transgressions, and fleeing to the blood of atonement for pardon and peace, you consecrate yourself to God the Father as the creature of his power and the willing subject of holy moral government: you devote yourself to the Lord Jesus Christ as bought with his precious blood, that you might live to him: you give yourself away to the spirit of life in Christ Jesus, as called by his grace and renewed by his power. You renounce this world and all its vanities as a portion, and separate yourself from all its pollutions and devote yourself to God, to serve Him in righteousness and holiness all the days of your life, while you receive Him as your present and eternal portion. You take God the Father as your Sovereign Lord; Christ as your redeemer, and the Holy Spirit as your enlightener, and sanctifier and comforter. Under his illumination you take the Scriptures as your sufficient and only guide; and resolve to conform your life to their sacred precepts.

You give yourself to this church of Christ as a fellow member of the same body; engaging to attend with them on the ordinances of the covenant, to submit yourself to their discipline and christian watchfulness, to bear your part in all the duties of the holy brotherhood, and to seek the edification of the whole and every member in faith and love.—Thus you give yourself to God and his people in the bonds of an everlasting covenant, never to be forgotten. Is this the purpose of your heart?

We then, the Church of our Lord in this place do gladly receive you into our sacred fellowship; and promise to conduct towards you with that christian affection, fidelity and watchfulness which are required by the holy relation we now sustain, and by the solemn vows we have assumed. This we do, imploring of our common Lord, that both we and you may obtain

grace to be faithful in his covenant, and glorify him with that holiness which becomes his house forever. Amen.

In December, 1827, deacon Moses Davis called on me for the purpose of discipline on the following articles, as nearly as I can recollect :—viz. For saying that our pastor, the Rev. Daniel S. Southmayd, did not preach the truth—to which I replied, that I thought he did not.

2. For saying that he did not preach Calvinism, nor the doctrine of the Trinity, any more than Dr. Ripley, nor half so much. Reply—I have not said all that.—I *have said* Mr. Southmayd does not preach Calvinism, any more than Dr. Ripley ; the remainder I have not said.

3. For saying that Mr. Southmayd admitted members to his church without any examination. Reply—I have not said it.

4. For saying that Mr. Josiah Davis was admitted to the church by a majority of one vote, and that too, put in by the moderator. Reply—I heard the story told in Mr. Melven's shop. Dr. Bartlett asked me if it was a fact.—I replied I had no reason to doubt it. And I *had* no reason to doubt it.

5. For circulating the "Cry from the North," and from "the Four Winds." Reply—I have disposed of a number of copies, and have a few on hand, which I shall continue to dispose of, if people want them, till they can be contradicted.

6. For saying that he [deacon Davis] was more anxious to get people into the *church*, than to *save souls*. Reply—I don't know to whom I have said it—it is a subject often conversed upon, I don't know but I have said it.—I think probable I have, and I think it wrong to have spoken of it, and I am sorry for it.—I don't know your motives nor your heart, but, sir, your conduct has been such as has appeared to me to evince something like it ; but I am sorry for having expressed myself thus to others.

It was remarked that these were principally public offences and ought to come before the church ; therefore it was agreed between us both to have the case laid before the church that evening, (which was their stated meeting) and have a meeting appointed for trial. This, however, was afterwards objected to by the pastor, on the ground that the regular steps of labour had not been taken, and he wished to follow the rules laid down in the 18th chapter of Matthew. Accordingly nothing was done about it in that meeting.

On Monday, December 24th, deacon Moses Davis, deacon John Vose and brother Francis Hunt, called on me for the

purpose of assisting deacon Davis in the second step of labor with me, when the following charges were presented for the first time :—viz.

1. For remarks respecting our pastor's preaching and conduct, tending to diminish his influence as an *evangelical minister*.

2. For observations derogatory to the piety and *christian character* of church members.

3. For circulating periodicals without a name, antichristian in their character, or libellous as it regards the conduct and preaching of many ministers of Christ and of many professed christians; and that too, after being warned of their injurious tendency by the pastor and other members of the church.

4. For attempting to bias the minds of some in the church and society against the proceedings of the church, and against the public performances of the pastor.

5. *Generally*, for conduct inconsistent with *christian* propriety.

6. For saying he was dissatisfied with the present administration, and did *intend* to have a different one.

This last charge was added by deacon Davis after they had labored with me for the preceding ones, and alleged to have been said to him at the time of his first labor with me, as a reason why I had pursued that course which had given this offence.

These charges were new; they were general; there was nothing definitely expressed in them. What could I do? I could not acknowledge them; neither could I deny them; I therefore did not acknowledge them, but put myself upon trial and requested the charges to be substantiated. With respect to the one that was added, I acknowledge that I was very much dissatisfied with Mr. Southmayd's preaching, and some of the proceedings of the church.

The deacon not being satisfied with this, the next Monday evening was appointed to lay the matter before the church, and to substantiate the charges, and to appoint another meeting in which I might make my defence.* On Tuesday morning, I left town and did not return until late on Saturday evening. On Sabbath day it was reported that a committee had been appointed on the Friday before, to see what could be brought up against me, and to ascertain what I had said respecting the pastor, or any of the members of the church. On Monday

* See Appendix, note B.

evening the meeting was attended, the charges were read, and a report of the committee above mentioned was called for, presented, and read. I have not a copy of this report, but the purport of it was, to the best of my recollection, as follows :

To the Trinitarian Church in Concord :

Rev. and beloved,

Your committee have attended to the business assigned them, and beg leave to report :—They have with very little examination obtained sufficient evidence to satisfy your committee beyond a doubt, that Joseph C. Green is guilty of the charges brought against him.

(Signed by)

DEA. MOSES DAVIS,
DEA. JOHN VOSE
CHARLES B. DAVIS,
ABIEL H WHEELER,
FRANCIS HUNT.

I was then called upon to answer to the charges, which I did in something like these words :—I do not understand these charges,—I do not know what they mean,—I cannot answer to them *directly* : in regard to the first charge, it is indefinite ; I may have said something comprehended in it, but I don't know what. I wish to know definitely, what is included in it.

In regard to the second charge, it is equally indefinite with the first ; I do not know what is contained in it,—I dot recollect saying any thing that could come under this charge.

As it respects the third charge, I deny it. The fourth charge I do not acknowledge. On the fifth charge I am not conscious of guilt. The sixth charge I acknowledge. I wish to have a fair and candid trial. Are there any witnesses here to prove these charges ? may I see them ? may I hear them ? may I question them ?

Pastor. There are witnesses to prove these things if you insist upon it.

Accused. I do sir ; but may I be allowed to say a few words and make one request previous ?

Pastor. You may.

[I then arose and addressed the church in nearly the following language.]

Accused. I am arraigned here on charges which involve the interests of the church collectively, and more or less affect many individuals, members of it. My own character too, as a christian, is involved in them. I have one favour to ask of you ; it is small for you to grant, and appears to me reasona-

ble to ask. I am obliged to engage in an unequal combat, and I labour under great disadvantages; I have to contend against the strong and violent prejudices of near two thirds of the church. [Here I was interrupted by the pastor, who cautioned me against saying any thing which might imply a charge against the church, as probably, two thirds of the church would not be willing to admit that they had prejudices against me; (probably he had forgotten some remarks he had made to individuals, when none of those circumstances existed, to excite prejudices against me which were now operating so powerfully, even so as to be plainly cognizable by the public;) I, however, feel myself perfectly justified, in view of all the testimony which can be obtained on this point, in saying what I did say; and I should have said, had I not been interrupted, that the *fear* of incurring similar prejudices *may* operate as a *powerful temptation* upon those, who otherwise might be my friends. I was then permitted to proceed.] The church, as a body, are arrayed against me; their *pastor*, my opponent; their *officers*, my *accusers*.—Thus I stand before you as a stripling before a giant—without counsel, without learning, and without friends; my hope is alone in the God of Jacob; but I *ask* this as a favor of you, viz. That I may have the privilege of speaking last in my defence. You may speak as many times, and as much, and what you please against me, but I ask the privilege of speaking last in defence of myself. Will you grant this request?

Pastor. It is what we cannot consistently grant—we don't know what you will say—we may wish to reply to it;—we shall be willing to give you a fair opportunity of speaking for yourself.*

Accused. Is not the church capable of judging the truth of what I may say?

They then proceeded to call the evidence in support of the first charge.

Dea. Moses Davis testified that he, (the accused) had said that he did not believe Mr. Southmayd preached the truth, according to his views of the gospel.

David Hartwell testified that sometime last fall, the accused and another person (Dr. Hubbard) came to him and found a great deal of fault with the minister and with the manner in which members were admitted to the church; but the accused did not say half so much as the one that was with him; but by

* See Appendix, note C.

what he could pick out of what he said, it seemed to be to put away our minister and try again. He said he doubted his having religion—he did not examine candidates thoroughly.

Accused. Did I tell you that he had no religion, or that I had no evidence of it.

Witness. You said he hadn't religion. I asked you if you had heard him tell his experience; "tell his experience," said you, "no!" and spoke it with much disdain. I was at Carlisle, and saw Dea. Jacobs; I asked him what the accused had been there for, and what his business was in Carlisle:* deacon Jacobs said that the accused told him that Mr. Southmayd was filling up his church with members that hadn't got religion.

Dea. Davis testified again, that the accused had said that Mr. Southmayd did not preach Calvinism any more than Dr. Ripley did.

On the second charge;

Dea. Davis testified that Mr. James Adams said that the accused had said that Mrs. Hunstable was a liar, or a hypocrite, and he had told her so. He further testified that in his first step of labour with the accused, he had charged him with saying that one member had been admitted to the church by a majority of one vote, and that was put in by Mr. Southmayd,—the accused denied that he first reported that story, but when Dr. Bartlett asked him if it was a fact, he replied, he had no reason to doubt it. This, I think, will come under this charge.

Dea. Davis further testified that the accused had said that he (Dea. Davis) was more anxious to get members into the church than he was to save souls.

Accused. Did I not make confession for this?

Dea. Davis. Yes; but you said it was your opinion that it was true, or something to that purpose.

On the third charge;

Dea. Davis. In my first labor with the accused he acknowledged he had circulated the Cry, and should continue to do so, till it should be proved to be false.

Charles B. Davis. Rev. sir, may I be permitted to say a few words: I have been informed that the accused has left several numbers of the Cry from the Four Winds at Dea. Vose's house since you warned him.

The question was then asked the pastor by the accused,—
"When did you first talk with me on this subject?"

* See Appendix, note D.

[By reference to dates, it was made to appear that the accused could not have left more than one number of the *Cry* at the house of Dea. Vose, and that, it has since been acknowledged, was borrowed.]

Pastor. Since I first talked with you, have you not distributed to subscribers, the numbers which have come to you?

Accused. I have: they belong to them, and I think it my duty to give them their own.

Pastor. Well, I think that is circulating them.

On the fourth charge;

Pastor. Mr. Hartwell, what can you say on this charge?

David Hartwell. I can say no more than I have said; the accused and the one that was with him, said enough, though the other one (Dr. H.) was the worst.

Accused, to Hartwell. Do you know of my going about to bias the minds of any persons, as it is stated I have?

David Hartwell. Didn't you come to my house?

Accused. No sir: I was riding with a gentleman to a neighboring town, and he stopped in the road to talk with you. I have not been to any persons to bias them.

David Hartwell. If you have not been to my honse, *where have you not been?**

The Pastor now called upon the church to know if any one could testify to any thing more, comprehended under this charge.

Charles B. Davis, then rose and said, Dea. White told me to day, that the accused said to him, that twenty-six members of the church were dissatisfied with Mr. Southmayd—and how could he know they were dissatisfied, if he had not been to see them?

On the fifth charge,

The pastor said, they did not know any thing of my conduct that was criminal: this charge did not respect my behaviour, but what I had said; and might be comprehended in the preceding ones. It was believed, however, that one member had a copy of a letter which might have some bearing to the purpose. Accordingly Mr. Francis Hunt produced a copy of a letter written by me, addressed to Mr. Heartwell Bigelow. The contents of this letter, *might* be so construed, as to give the impression that I wished Mr. B. to assist me in cheating a man out of fifty cents, but an unprejudiced reader would not be likely to receive such an impression from it.†

* This was said with an air very unbecoming a christian, which, I presume, will be acknowledged by all present.

† I have not a copy of this letter, or I would publish it.

The sixth charge having been acknowledged, no testimony was needed.

I was now called to answer to the charge, thus substantiated against me.

I replied,—What I have said, I can prove to be *true*, and I wish for an opportunity to defend myself for saying it. In regard to Mr. Adams' second-hand testimony, I deny it. I wish to hear Mr. Adams give his evidence himself.

Pastor. We do not mean to contend with our brother; this is not a court of justice, we only want he should confess his faults, and be sorry for them.

Josiah Davis. Mr. Green, we do not wish to enter into any litigation with you, we only wish you to make suitable satisfaction to the church.

Francis Hunt. Mr. Green, may I ask you if you are not the writer of several pieces in the *Cry from the Four Winds*, relating to this town?

Accused. That is a question which I shall not answer here. If I should deny it, you would charge it upon some other member of this church.

Pastor. Whoever the writer may be, ought he not to bear the blame of it?

Accused. If there be any blame attached to them I am willing to bear it.

Josiah Davis. Mr. Green, may I ask you a few questions? you may do as you please about answering them. Do you blame the church for labouring with you?

Accused. No sir.

Josiah Davis. Had any other member said what you have, should you not have thought they ought to have been dealt with?

Accused. Yes sir.

Abel Davis. Mr. Green, have you done what you have, with a view to the glory of God?

Accused. I think I have.

Abel Davis. Then I am sorry for you.

David Hartwell. He acts like a *put out* man. [This was expressed with such an air, that he was checked by the pastor, and indeed it was necessary, in order to prevent a tumult.]

The Pastor now addressed the church; the purport of which was, that it appeared to him necessary to take a vote on the subject that night, to see if the church should think brother

Green worthy of admonition. He thought brother Green had broken his covenant with them, and ought to be admonished, &c.

Josiah Davis then rose, and remarked something on the nature of an admonition. I must confess that I could not understand his definition of it, but thought it was calculated to give the church an impression, that an admonition was something, giving me an opportunity to defend myself. With this impression, I inquired of the pastor what we were to *understand* by an admonition, and was answered that the *church* understood what it meant, and that he would write it so that *I* should know what it meant. I again asked if I might not be allowed to make a defence, but received no reply.

David Hartwell then said, "I have a different way of thinking and acting, than other folks, and *I* think that if we keep this *Jonah* aboard the ship, we shall founder soon."*

The pastor again addressed the church to the following purpose:—I do feel that it is important that we should act on this subject. If you should see a stream running beneath this house, gulling away the foundation of it, and growing wider and wider, and threatening the speedy overthrow of it, would you not think that immediate action was necessary? So in this case, the cause of God and his church require immediate action, and it appears to me we *ought* to act on this subject.—[Interrupted by David Hartwell,—"*act!* we are *all ready* to act!"'] The pastor proceeded,—delay is dangerous, the breach is growing wider and wider, and I fear we have already incurred the anger of God upon us. The anxiety which I feel on this account, till this is settled, is great; therefore, I do think that we ought to act on this subject to-night, so as to give Mr. Green time to reflect and prepare himself to bring the matter to a close next Friday night.

The vote was then taken, and reported to be twenty-one for admonition, and one against it. The meeting was then adjourned till Friday, and closed.

The church consists of fifty-three members, which are voters.† This was a special meeting,—a punctual attendance was requested,—every member knew the object of the meeting, and it was a beautiful, pleasant evening; yet but twenty-two votes could be obtained.

The following is a copy of a letter which I received the next morning, called a letter of admonition.

* See Appendix, note E.

† It has been the custom for females to vote in this church.

Concord, Mass. Friday evening, Dec. 31, 1827.*

To JOSEPH C. GREEN,

Dear Brother,—By an almost unanimous vote of the church, taken this evening, it becomes my painful task to admonish you for conduct inconsistent with a christian character. The church believe you have brought dishonour on the cause of Christ, and have broken your covenant with them, by the course you have pursued.

They are grieved with you, and they admonish you,

1. For saying at different times, and to different individuals, that their pastor does not preach the truth.

2. For saying in similar circumstances, that their pastor is not orthodox or Calvinistic,—thus producing disorder.

3. For asserting that members are admitted to the church without suitable examination, so that those whose piety is questionable have been admitted.

4. For asserting that twenty-six members of the church were dissatisfied with the present administration.

5. For saying that you are dissatisfied with the present administration, and that you intend to have a different one.

6. For circulating periodicals, tending to disturb the peace of the church, and to create discord and false impressions.

On the above charges the church feel satisfied of your guilt, and require from you a full, and frank, and christian confession on the next Friday evening at their appointed meeting. They would admonish you as their brother, and exhort you to examine your course in the fear of God, and they would beseech you to imbibe the spirit and the temper of Christ. Attend to this admonition, my brother, and save the church from proceeding any further. Confess your sins to God, and to his church. Reflect solemnly on the course you have pursued, and may God grant you that repentance which is unto life, through Jesus Christ!

In behalf of the church, I subscribe myself,

Yours, in the Lord,

DANIEL S. SOUTHMAYD.

Proceedings of an adjourned meeting, held on Friday evening, January 4, 1828.—Twenty-two members only present.

After reading the records of the last Monday evening's proceedings, I was called on to make such satisfaction to the

* A mistake of the pastor in the day, probably.

church, as I might think proper. I then handed the pastor a paper containing the following lines.

I have received a letter from the church, in which I am condemned, as guilty on all the charges contained in it, and am sentenced to make a full, and frank, and christian confession before you this evening.—In reply to which, I have only to say, that I *can prove* all I have been accused of saying, to be *true*, and can render a reason, (which I think must be satisfactory to every candid mind,) for saying it; therefore, I cannot comply with the requisition contained in your letter. You may therefore proceed to do whatever you please with me.

JOSEPH C. GREEN.

Concord, Jan. 4, 1828.

After this had been read, the pastor asked what order they would take on it. After a few minutes silence David Hartwell wished to hear it read again. After the second reading, Abel Davis inquired for a copy of the admonition: as none could be obtained, I handed him the original, which was read.

Dea. Davis then got up and motioned that the church act on this subject, to see if Mr. Green had made such confession as was required in that letter.

Green. I do not pretend, sir, to make such confession as is required in the letter, I *cannot* do it.

Nathan Robbins. Mr. Green says that he can prove what he has said, to be true, and give satisfactory reasons for saying it; ought we not therefore to hear him?

Green. This was what I asked last Monday, but this letter entirely precluded any defence.

Pastor. We have not charged Mr. Green, with saying that which is not *true*, but with saying *certain things*—which is a breach of covenant, even on the supposition that they are true. On the supposition that members *are* received to the church whose piety is questionable, yet it is calculated to disturb the peace of the church, for any member to say so, and therefore is a breach of covenant. We did not act on Monday evening upon the plea that Mr. Green should prove the truth of what he said, but that he should make confession for having disturbed the peace of the church. For a person to do that intentionally, which he knows is calculated to disturb the peace of the church, I think is a breach of covenant; and Mr. Green, I presume, will acknowledge that what he has done, has been done with that intention—will you not, Mr. Green?

Green. If we were to enter upon this subject, the ques-

tion would probably arise, what is a church? I have formerly done that which was calculated to disturb the peace of the old church in this place, and I felt it to be my duty to do it; and in this case I have acted with similar feelings.

Pastor. This church is entirely different from that, being built on a different foundation; we have laid Jesus Christ as the chief corner stone, and if we build on him, though we build nothing but wood, hay, and stubble, yet we are christians, and probably this church would not be willing to acknowledge they were not a christian church.

Green. I believe that the old church was originally built on a similar foundation to this, and at the time I obtained my dismission from it, many of the members of this church were members of that church; and I considered it a christian church.—Neither do I allege that this is not a christian church. The Universalists pretend to build on Christ as the chief corner stone, and they exalt the Saviour as much as we do. I think that every corner stone should be laid on a foundation, and that Jesus Christ should be laid according to the apostles and prophets.

Abel Davis. Mr. Green, don't you think that you have done that which has grieved the feelings of the church?

Green. I don't know the feelings of the church.

David Hartwell. You don't feel sorry for what you have done, but appear to be glad.

Green. I see no occasion for being sorry.

Hartwell. Then you are glad.

The pastor now came to me and said, they should wish to consult together on the subject, and I might withdraw. My wife and I then retired.

On Saturday I received the following letter:

Concord, Mass. Friday evening, Jan. 4, 1828.

TO JOSEPH C. GREEN,

I am directed to communicate to you the following resolution of the church, taken this evening.

“Whereas our brother Joseph C. Green, having been laboured with by the church for breach of covenant in the following particulars, viz:

1. For saying at different times, and to different persons, that their pastor did not preach the truth.

2. For saying in similar circumstances, that our pastor is not orthodox or Calvinistic—thus producing disorder.

3. For asserting that members are admitted to the church

without suitable examination, so that those whose piety is questionable have been admitted.

4. For asserting to one or more that *twenty-six* members of the church are dissatisfied with the present administration.

5. For saying that *he* was dissatisfied with the present administration, and that he intended to have a different one.

6. For circulating periodicals tending to disturb the peace of the church, and to create discord and false impressions.

"And whereas he has refused to give satisfaction to the church according to the gospel rule; therefore, *Resolved*, That our brother, Joseph C. Green, be; and by this act of the church, he hereby is excluded from our communion and favor, and all the privileges of this church of Christ."

In behalf of the Church,

DANIEL S. SOUTHMAYD, *Pastor*.

Until I received the letter of admonition, I had some hope of being allowed the privilege of speaking for myself, but this precluded such a hope. Therefore I make my appeal to the public.

In order to clear myself from these charges, it devolves upon me to prove—1. That Mr. Southmayd has not preached the truth—at least according to my views of divine truth, or that he has preached something that is not true.—2. That he is not orthodox, or a Calvinist.—3. That members have been admitted to the church, without suitable examination, and that those have been admitted whose piety has been questioned.—4. That twenty-six members of the church have been dissatisfied with the present administration, or, show that such an assertion was not criminal under the circumstances which it was made.—5. To show sufficient reason why I am dissatisfied with the present administration, and why I intend to have a different one.—6. To justify myself for circulating the "Cries," so far as I have been in the practice of it.

It may also be expected that I should reply to the charges and testimony brought against me, but not noticed in the admonition. Lastly, To justify myself for speaking these truths in public.

I shall now attempt to prove—1. That Mr. Southmayd has not preached the truth, at least according to my views of truth, or that he has preached something that is not true. I shall do this by a review of some of his sermons. And here it may be proper for me to state that my views of Divine truth, are generally comprehended in Calvin's Institutes.

In one of his sermons preached the 7th October, 1827, was this expression. "Many, even in these days, obstinately oppose and despise him, (John Calvin,) but it is because they do not know his character, nor have not read his writings." It does not need a very elaborate argument to convince any man that this assertion is false. Who does not know that there have been and still are, a great many who are well acquainted with both the character and writings of John Calvin, and are, notwithstanding, most violent and obstinate opposers of the doctrines which he taught? Yea, who, that even read his institutes, does not know, that a vast many professing to be Calvinists, would nevertheless quarrel with his writings if they should be made acquainted with them! It is not a knowledge of the man, or his writings, that will secure him followers, but a love for, and cordial reception of the doctrines which he inculcated. The Lord Jesus Christ must be acknowledged to be as worthy of love and esteem as Calvin; and yet he expressly declares that the Jews had both seen and hated both him and his Father. It appears to me to be needless to say any thing more in order to prove this assertion false.

Sermon preached November 18th, from Luke, 19: 41, 42. "The things which belonged to the peace of the Jews and were hidden from their eyes, were the unparelled calamities that befel them in the destruction of their city—The things that belong to the sinners peace are the awful punishments that await them in a future world, and these are hidden from their eyes." Now if this *be* true, in what way will these calamities and punishments conduce to the sinner's peace? Will they in time fit him to be restored to the favor and presence of God? This is the only way in which I can see how *these things* can belong to the sinner's peace, and this is restoration doctrine and therefore is not true, at least according to *my views* of truth.

Again, if these things belong to the sinner's peace, of what use is the gospel? The *law* will answer every purpose of showing him the punishment which awaits him, and I can see no occasion for the gospel.

Same sermon. "Could sinners but see their end, nothing could prevent them from calling on God for help and pardon." Read the account of the death of Sir Francis Newport, and judge whether this be true. Same sermon. "Listen seriously and prayerfully to the warnings and invitations which you receive, for perhaps the hand that writes your doom is already tracing it in the book that is chained to the throne of the Eternal—Listen, that you may reverse the doom that will otherwise

be irrevocable." Perhaps a part of this was borrowed from Dr. Watts, if so, I think it a pity he had not taken all that author's ideas, for I think that they are much more correct than those expressed above. Now you will remember that I believe in the Decrees of God, and therefore those ideas cannot be the truth, according to *my views* of it. If the doctrine of Divine Decrees is true, then no doom which is not already written, can be traced in that book, and that which is written cannot be revoked.

Thanksgiving Sermon. "There was a time when the church was asleep, but she began to awake about fifty years ago.—Christians were inactive because they had imbibed the dangerous doctrine that God would in his own time accomplish his work; but now christians have become more active and combined vigorous efforts with their prayers."

"Mr. Whitfield and his cotemporaries, broke the slumbers of the church, and directed their preaching to the conscience and the hearts of their hearers, and multitudes were converted. After these holy men had gone, the church again sunk into slumber and a different course of preaching was pursued for seventy years. The ministers of the gospel preached about technical terms and doctrinal points, and left the essentials of religion, to contend about forms.—Within a few years, christians have been awake; a new mode of preaching has been adopted, which has been directed to the heart and conscience, and has resulted in great and glorious success. From time to time new churches are seen springing into existence, christians are more humble and lie low in the dust before God, and pray with more fervor and faith. A *change* has taken place and it is a great change.—It is by prayer and energetic exertions that the world is to be converted.—To oppose the Pope, who is gaining strength, and making new acquisitions in numbers and in power, will require the wisdom of God given in *consequence* of prayer and exertion.—In this *society*, since the last anniversary festival, this house has been dedicated to God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Its numbers have more than doubled and we have acquired that strength which renders our success beyond a doubt. In the same time also the members of the church have more than doubled and we have *good* reason to hope that all these bow to the Lord Jesus in sincerity.—Twenty or thirty more entertain hopes, and eight are expected to unite with us at our next communion, and the Spirit of the Lord is still among us and the work is yet going on."

I remark.—1. If it be *dangerous*, to imbibe the doctrine,

that God, in his own good time will accomplish his work, shall we find this doctrine in the Bible? and I leave every man to judge, if it be not plainly taught in Calvin's Institutes. Again, I ask, if it be not a fact, that those christians who have imbibed this doctrine, are *much more active*, than those persons who deny the Decrees and Agency of God? The church it is said, *had been* asleep, but began to awake about fifty years ago. Mr. Whitfield and his cotemporaries, *broke the slumbers of the church*, and after these men were gone, she again went to sleep. It is ninety-one years since Mr. Whitfield first visited America, and it is fifty-eight years since he died at Newburyport. Now how can we reconcile these dates and all these statements? Whitfield, more than ninety years ago broke the slumbers of the church and kept them broken for more than thirty years, and yet she remained asleep until eight years after Whitfield's death. Upon the death of this good man a different course of preaching was pursued, wherein the essentials of religion were left out and something else was contended for, and yet the church, which had remained asleep through all Mr. Whitfield's faithful labors, began to awake in eight years after, while enjoying that preaching which was destitute of the essentials of religion. This course of preaching which commenced only fifty-eight years ago, was pursued for seventy years, and yet we are told that within a few years, christians have been awake and a new mode of preaching has been adopted, represented to be similar to Whitfield's, and productive of similar effects. Now I do not believe this statement *can be true*. Again, we are told that christians, are *now*, more humble and prayerful and faithful than formerly. Is there any proof of this assertion? what greater evidence of humility do christians give us these days than those who lived fifty years ago? Ask the aged disciple, who has lived fifty years in the service of Christ, if his *younger brethren* appear more humble and faithful, than his youthful companions in the Lord did; and will he not answer you with a sigh and deplore the pride and haughtiness of the church and perhaps fore-warn you of her fall unless she repent! What is the spirit of this sermon, is it more meek and humble than the writings of Whitfield, Edwards and Bellamy? or does it evince a boasting, vainglorious spirit? Is it not most manifest, that the assertion under consideration is not true?

"We have acquired that strength, which renders our success beyond a doubt." This is not true. I know it to be a fact, that a great many of the inhabitants of this town, who are rational and judicious men, have doubts of the success of this

society, and I also know that a large proportion of the church have doubts of the success of their undertakings, and *some* of them have *very much doubted* the existence of the church in its present form, even for the space of two years ; and if I am not mistaken Mr. S. was apprised of *some* of these facts before he preached this sermon, and it is *possible* that this sermon was written to counteract these doubts, and give the public the impression that all was going on smoothly, while within all was, I may almost say rancour and tumult.

“The members of this church have more than doubled in the past year, and we have *good* reason to hope that *all* these love the Lord Jesus in sincerity.” Now if this were true, I think it very imprudent for a minister of the gospel to assert it in the pulpit, for persons who were not possessed of more *knowledge* and *grace* than I am, would in consequence of such adulation, (if they believed it,) become elated and vain, and it appears to me to have had that effect upon some : but let us inquire whether Mr. S. *could reasonably* believe the truth of his assertion *himself*. *I* was a member of the church, and I had *then* said and done as much against Mr. S. and against the church as they have now brought against me, and Mr. S. *knew* it, for I had said it to him ; and if I could love the Lord Jesus in sincerity *then*, why may I not *now* do it ! and if there was good evidence of it, why is there not as much evidence *now* ! I do not know that I have altered any since. Again ; but a few days previous to the delivering of this sermon, Mr. S. said to some of his parishioners, that there must be new regulations in the sabbath school, we must have pious men for teachers, and asked a person who did not belong to his church, if he would take the superintendence of it. Yet the school was at this very time under the superintendence of a man elected by the *unanimous* vote of the teachers, who had been authorized by the church to elect their own superintendents, and all the male teachers and superintendents, were persons whom *he* had admitted to the church during the past year, and *must* be included in the number of those whom he had good reason to hope were christians.

“Twenty or thirty more are entertaining hopes” &c. I have inquired of a considerable number of our church members who appear to be the most devoted, engaged and discriminating members, and I have not been able among them all, to hear of one third part that number, who give any evidence that they have reasonable grounds to hope they have become new creatures in Christ Jesus. “Eight are expected to unite with us

at our next communion." Five of these came by letter—three from a Unitarian church. "The spirit of the Lord is still among us, and the work is yet going on." This implies that we had enjoyed a revival of religion, and that it was yet in progress. I shall not attempt now to prove that there has not been a genuine revival here, for there have been *some* hopeful conversions during the last eighteen months. I shall only say that I am not the *only* church member who has *very much doubted* the apparent excitement here, being so genuine as it has been represented to be. But very few have given satisfactory evidence of a change of heart, and these have uniformly attributed the means, under God, of their conversion, to other labors than those which we stately enjoy. But, if on the 29th of November the revival was progressing, why has the inquiry meetings, in less than four weeks, been given up? This cannot be attributed to *me*, for I have been out of town *half* the time, and do not know that I have spoken to a single member of the inquiry meeting during this time.

November 30th at a preparatory lecture, speaking on 1. Cor. 15: 8. Mr. S. said "that Christ appeared to Saul of Tarsus, while on his way to Damascus with letters from the high priest, to arrest the disciples, before his ascension."

Mr. Southmayd has said in some of his sermons, that God requires no more of sinners, than they are capable of performing. In another sermon he says "God's demands will *always* be the same. God, himself, says, to sinners, *Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and soul and strength.*" And I add, can any good reason be given, why *all* intelligent creatures, whether in *heaven, earth or hell* should not immediately comply with this command and forever continue to fulfil it? Yet Mr. S. says, in the conversation above alluded to, that "*holiness*, consists in *interested* exercises, and that it is utterly *impossible* for any person to love God from any other consideration than that God will make him happy." God has required of sinners, *without any exceptions*, that they love him with all their heart &c., and Mr. S. says that God will *always* require this, and he also says that, he requires nothing but what the sinner is capable of performing; and yet in his conversation he says, it is *utterly impossible* for *some* sinners to love God, unless we understand him to believe in the final restoration of all men to happiness and the favour of God, from the consideration of which it *may be possible* for them to love him. Now I believe, that if it be *impossible* for sinners to love God from any other consideration than this, it is *utterly im-*

possible for them to love him at *all*. Thus you see, that according to *my views*, this is not preaching the truth.

In the fore part of the sermon under consideration, Mr. S. had said we had been misrepresented, and accused of holding sentiments which he said we did not believe, and mentioned a number of articles, *some* of which *I*, consider to be the distinguishing points of Calvinism, and which *I* and a *number* of others belonging to that church, do most firmly believe. One of which I recollect to be, the vindictive justice of God. Another, if I rightly recollect, was, that God is not angry, in the common sense of the word, *implying* that it was an unsuitable term, by which to convey to us a correct idea of God's wrath. Again, "The law was given because of man's depravity." I ask, wherein consisted Adam's depravity when he first received a law? Once more, "To say that sinners are under condemnation, is only saying that they are pursuing a course that leads to destruction." But the scriptures say, "He that believeth on him is not condemned; but he that believeth not, *is condemned already*," John iii. 18. Must not, therefore, every unbeliever, not only forsake his sins and turn unto the Lord, but also receive the justifying grace of God by faith, before he can be made the partaker of "that rest which remaineth for the people of God?" Suppose a sinner who is *now* pursuing the course that leads to destruction, should quit that course, and fulfil the whole law, until the moment of his death, will he not, without that justification which is by faith, find himself still under condemnation?

In his sermon Dec. 16, Mr. S. says, "the christian possesses a new principle—a *new motive to holiness*." I acknowledge the christian acts on a new principle, but I deny the *motive to holiness* being a new one. The glory of God, is the christian's motive to holiness, but *this motive* is presented to *every sinner* under the gospel, and he is commanded to love God in view of it. Although a compliance with this command is the first holy exercise of the christian, yet this does not make the *motive to holiness* a *new* one. It is only a *new* and a *right* exercise in compliance with a command which has been always binding upon him, and in view of a motive which has been always before him.

I now come to the second charge, upon which it devolves upon me to prove that Mr. S. is not an Orthodox, or a Calvinist. The definition of orthodox, according to Walker, is, sound in opinion and doctrine, not heretical. If I have proved what I have attempted on the first charge, it is equally applicable to

this part of the second, and taking it for granted that I have, I shall pass over this without further notice, and attempt to prove that Mr. S. is not a Calvinist. And here we shall have to review his sermons again, and compare them with the writings of Calvin.

Sermon Dec. 2. "The inhabitants of Crete had embraced the erroneous doctrine that *faith alone* was necessary to salvation, and many in our days have imbibed the same sentiments." But Calvin says in Book iii, chap. ix, sec. 13, "But as many persons imagine righteousness to be composed of *faith and works*, let us also prove, before we proceed, that the righteousness of *faith* is so exceedingly *different* from that of *works*, that if one be established, the other must necessarily be subverted." Sermon. "It is an established fact, God saves sinners in consequence of the prayers and exertions of his children." I here insert a quotation from Hopkins, because it more fully, explicitly and comprehensively expresses Calvin's ideas on this subject than any thing I can readily turn to in his institutes. "They (the redeemed) see the human heart acted out in the unbeliever, and the awful consequence, in his perishing; and know this would have been their case, had not God created in them a new heart, and given them to believe on Christ, in *consequence* of his electing love." Vol. II, p. 183.

Sermon Dec. 2. "Sinners are not lost, because God has made them for that purpose." Calvin, Book iii chap. xxi. "If it be evidently the result of the Divine will, that salvation is freely offered to some, and others are prevented from attaining it, this immediately gives rise to important and difficult questions, which are incapable of any other explication than by the establishment of pious minds in what ought to be received concerning election and predestination:—A question, in the opinion of many, full of perplexity; for they consider nothing more unreasonable, than that of the common mass of mankind, some should be predestinated to salvation, and others to destruction. But how unreasonably they perplex themselves, will afterwards appear from the sequel of our discourse. Predestination we call the eternal decree of God, by which he hath determined in himself, what he would have become of every individual of mankind. For they are not all created with a similar destiny; but eternal life is fore-ordained for some, and eternal destruction for others."

Sermon. "God is not vindictive." Cal. book iii, ch. iv. sec. 33. The second distinction is that when the reprobates are lashed by the scourges of God in this world, they already begin to suf-

fer his *vindictive* punishment, and though they will not escape with impurity for having disregarded such indications of the Divine wrath, yet they are not punished in order to their repentance, but only that from their great misery, they may prove God to be a judge who will inflict *vengeance* according to their crimes.—Therefore, when he rejected Saul from the kingdom, he punished him in a *vindictive* manner; when he deprived David of his infant son, he corrected him in order to his reformation.” Sermon. “If sinners perish, it is not because God elects some to be saved.—Cannot God save some, without preventing others from being saved? Does God’s determination to save some, destroy the salvation of others?”

Calvin, B. III. chap. xxiii. sec. 1. “Many indeed (thinking to excuse God,) own election, and yet deny reprobation; but this is quite silly and childish. For without reprobation, election itself cannot stand; whom God passes by, those he reprobates.

Sermon. “He, (God) has not determined that they should be saved, only in *consequence* of their obeying the truth.—He has not determined to save any unless the conditions be fulfilled.—If it were possible for the christian to sin, God’s determination could not save him, because the conditions which God determined should be kept, had not been fulfilled.—God’s purpose does not respect the *means*, but the *sinner* or the *christian*.”

“It is a notion commonly entertained, that God, foreseeing what would be the respective merits of every individual, makes a correspondent distinction between different persons; that he adopts as his children such as he foreknows will be deserving of his grace; and devotes to the damnation of death others whose dispositions he sees will be inclined to wickedness and impiety. Thus they not only obscure election by covering it with the vail of fore-knowledge, but pretend that it originates in another cause. Paul, on the contrary, declares that all the *virtue* discovered in men is the *effect* of *election*. This overturns the means of election which men imagine in themselves; for all the benefits conferred by God for the spiritual life, he represents as flowing from this one source, that God elected whom he would; and, before they were born, laid up for them the grace with which he determined to favour them.—For when it is said, that the faithful were elected that they should be holy, it is fully implied, that the holiness they were in future to possess had its origin in election. If therefore, we can assign no reason why he grants mercy to his people but because such is

his pleasure, neither shall we find any other cause but his will for the reprobation of others." Cal. B. iii. chap. xxi. sec. 7.

Sermon. "One of God's purposes, is that we should repent &c. God has determined and pledged himself, that for the sake of Christ, he will save every one that has been redeemed by the blood of the everlasting covenant." Comparing this latter sentence with the foregoing one, we naturally conclude that redemption is here used in its *general* sense, which signifies atonement. Mr. S. has frequently, in former discourses, asserted the *universality* of the atonement, therefore if we admit this construction, (and he has given no other,) instead of making Mr. S. a Calvinist, it will prove him to be a Universalist. And to this point, permit me to introduce the testimony of Mr. Asa Bigelow, a restoration Universalist, who was called as a witness on my part, but was refused admittance. Mr. Bigelow says, that in conversation with Mr. Southmayd, he proposed the following questions, viz. "Is God omnipotently *powerful*? Is God infinitely *good*? Could not God have made all men to be happy?" To which Mr. S. answered in the affirmative. He then asked, "If God does not make all men happy, will it not *diminish* his *goodness*?" Mr. S. replied, that he had thought a good deal on that subject, and did not feel satisfied; he did not know but that *all* would finally be restored to the favor and enjoyment of God, but there was enough revealed to make us fear a dreadful punishment. Now is this consistent with his being orthodox or a Calvinist? Has not Mr. S. here admitted, implicitly at least the very *ground* and *foundation* of Universalism, viz. "That the scheme of revolution has the happiness of all mankind lying at the bottom, as its great and ultimate end?" See Adams' View of Religion, p. 187. If Mr. S. had really been a Calvinist, would he have given such an answer to Mr. Bigelow's question? As a further testimony I would observe, that every thing of a discriminating character, by which a person could judge of his being Calvinistic, has been reviewed, and would a Calvinist preach eleven months, and an half in a place without advancing any thing more of a discriminating character, than has been here brought into view? Could a conscientious Calvinist, preach a whole year to a Calvinistic church, without giving them an opportunity to know that he was a Calvinist?

Further, a few weeks since, Mr. S. acknowledged to me in presence of witness, that his views were similar to Doddridge's and Baxter's, for an account of which I refer to Adam's View of religion. See Baxterians p. 70. Suffice it to say here that

it is in *direct opposition* to Calvinism. Again, on the first Monday of December last, as a member of this society was expressing the grounds of his dissatisfaction to Dea. Davis, he was answered by the Dea. that he knew it was not the *old* fashion sort of Calvinism—it was a new kind, that was pretty generally adopted throughout the New-England States, and was considered to be better than the old Calvinism.

Mr. Southmayd, conversing with a Methodist, on election, so explained the doctrine, as to coincide perfectly with her views. He has also, further said, “the doctrines of the gospel, ought to be kept out of view in a time of revival,—get persons into the church, and the doctrines will come of course.” Would a conscientious *Calvinist* say this? I think I have now produced sufficient evidence to prove that Mr. Southmayd is neither Oorthodox nor a Calvinist; I shall now attend to the third charge.—On which I shall attempt to prove that members have been admitted to the church without suitable examination, and that those have been admitted, whose piety has been questioned.

There was one member admitted last spring, whose piety was doubted by the world, and by some of the church, so much so, that immediately after the vote was declared in the affirmative, objection was made, but Mr. Southmayd, (then a candidate,) said it was too late to receive any objection, therefore, the person was admitted. The subsequent conduct of this person, being the general topic of conversation in the town, Mr. S., as I have been credibly informed, has been heard to say, that if he had been the Pastor of the church, this person would not have been admitted. But, I can testify, that the mother of this person told me her child would not have come forward at that time, had not Mr. S. advised to that measure.

Many members of this church, have repeatedly refused to vote for the admission of candidates, in consequence of the superficial examination of them. In July last, several candidates were examined in so superficial a manner, as to give great dissatisfaction and uneasiness to several members of the church, and some of them were subsequently examined by individuals. Mr. S. was complained to at the time, and at a subsequent meeting of the church, when these candidates were admitted, Mr. S. harranged the church in a manner calculated to bias the minds of the members in favor of the candidates, and when afterwards complained to for it, he acknowledged he had reason to believe that two of them would have been rejected if he had not taken that course; he however promised the individu-

als who conversed with him on the subject, that they should have opportunity in private to examine candidates to their satisfaction.

At the next admission, four candidates presented themselves for examination. At the close of the usual exercises of the meeting the examination was attended to. At a quarter past nine o'clock, the members of the church were given an opportunity to ask the candidates questions. I wanted to adjourn the meeting to another evening, on account of the lateness of the hour, but this was overruled by the Pastor, therefore some questions were put to two of the candidates, until it was so late, that it became necessary to dispense with the examination, and close the meeting. At the next meeting, the Pastor was absent, but had left a supply. A considerable part of the church not being fully satisfied with the former examination, had requested the candidates to attend at this meeting, at which they were examined to their satisfaction. At the end of two weeks, it being the usual time to receive candidates, and the Pastor being in town, though absent from the meeting, (but on a call at a neighboring house,) the vote was taken for the admission of these candidates, when one was rejected, having nine votes for, and ten against his admission. The rejection of this member gave great umbrage to the Pastor and to some of the members of the church. At the next admission to the church, however, this same person came forward again, though he gave no more satisfactory evidence of experimental piety, yet he was admitted, and that too, in the face of facts, which cannot be related here without casting a scandal upon private characters, which it is my endeavor to avoid as much as possible in this defence.

At the same time, three or four others were examined, and I think that a suitable examination for the admission of members to a *Calvinistic* church, will comprehend doctrinal subjects, but these candidates were not examined on any of the distinguishing doctrines of Calvinism, except the Trinity, as if that were all that was necessary to be argeed upon, in order to enjoy union and harmony in the church. These persons were all admitted. There were but twenty-four voters present. One of these persons had eleven votes against him, another had ten, and all had some against them, and those persons voted against them because they questioned their piety, and they remain of the same mind now, unless they have altered it very recently. Enough has been said on this charge; could I have been heard before the church, I could have brought abundant testimony in proof of these assertions.

Let us now attend to the fourth charge, on which I shall attempt to prove, that twenty-six members of the church have been dissatisfied with the present administration, or show that such an assertion was not criminal under the circumstances in which it was made.

Previous to the 1st of October last, one other male member and myself, had heard twenty-six members of the church express decided dissatisfaction with the preaching and proceedings of the Pastor. The church at this time contained only forty-five members. After there had been vigorous exertions made to suppress the open expression of this dissatisfaction; Dea. White conversing with me alone, on the subject, inquired, if there were many who were dissatisfied. I replied, that twenty-six had expressed their dissatisfaction. I appeal to the public to decide on my criminality under this charge. Fifth charge. I am here to show sufficient reason why I am dissatisfied with the present administration, and why I intend to have a different one. And 1. I am dissatisfied because I believe Mr. S. does not preach the gospel:—2. Because I believe Mr. S. is neither orthodox, nor Calvinistic:—3. Because members are admitted to the church without giving any reasonable evidence of experimental piety:—4. Because the proceedings of the church and Pastor are calculated to produce discord, division, and finally, destruction in the church:—5. Because Mr. S's preaching is calculated to deceive and delude sinners, and induce them to embrace false hopes, and thus seal their eternal destruction:—6. Because I think that Mr. S. has conducted in a manner unbecoming a minister of the gospel:—7. Because Mr. S. has said, that he had told a young man, that he *must* leave town, and if he did not go, he should feel it to be his duty as a christian, to use his exertion to prevent his getting business or doing business. This I believe to be incompatible with a christian spirit.

Lastly. Because I fully believe that Mr. S's intention has ever been, (since he has been among us,) to destroy the existence of Calvinistic sentiments in this church, and establish those of a more liberal character. Therefore, it is my intention to have a different administration.

1. That the gospel may be preached:—2. That we may have an orthodox and a Calvinistic minister:—3. That members may not be admitted to the church until they give *good evidence* of internal piety:—4. That the church may be built up in union and harmony, and be established in the faith of the gospel:—5. That sinners may be instructed in the

truth, and christians fed with the sincere milk of the word, that they may grow thereby:—6. That we may have a minister whose conduct shall be more according to the gospel:—7. Because I do not believe it can be the duty of a christian to command a man to leave the town, and to attempt to starve him to death if he does not comply, and I believe it to be dangerous to have ministers of this description patronized:—8. Because I believe Mr. Southmayd's ideas of true holiness, to be as erroneous as Universalism, and his motives to it, utterly incapable of ever producing any thing but a selfish exercise. If these reasons will not justify me for asserting what is contained in this charge, then I must remain condemned.

On the sixth charge, I shall attempt to justify myself for circulating the Cries, so far as I have been concerned in it.

Dea. Davis testified that in his first labor with me, I did acknowledge circulating the Cries, and said I should continue to do it, till they should be proved to be false. Now this has never been done to my knowledge.

A word on C. B. Davis' testimony. He says he has been informed that I had left *several* numbers of the "Cry from the four winds" at Dea. Vose's house since I had been warned by the Pastor.

Now I do not like to say that Mr. Davis meant to tell a falsehood, but I do believe he acted under the influence of a *great deal* of prejudice. Now if this had been done by me, why was not a witness called upon to testify to it, instead of this round about testimony. It has also been made to appear, that I could not have left but *one* number after I had been warned by the Pastor, and here I declare, that I never have been warned by any *other* member of the church, until after labor was commenced with me. I can also produce testimony to prove that that number was borrowed of me. The fact, that I have distributed to subscribers, the bundle of Cries sent to me, may be criminal in the view of our Pastor, but, *not* to have done it, would have been criminal in the sight of my own conscience.

In justification of myself, I say that the Cries contain many facts of which the church ought not to be ignorant; facts too, which could never have obtained an existence, had not the church been kept in ignorance of the dangers of certain individuals, who are interested in the policy, which it is the object of the Cries to expose.

I would not impeach the piety of any individuals concerned in those transactions, for I believe a *christian* is capable of

committing *any* sin, except that, which is emphatically denominated, the sin against the Holy Ghost, yet I do not believe they ought to be justified in their sins; neither do I believe that while in the commission of these sins, they *have*, or *can give* any *good* evidence of their being *real* christians, nor do I think them deserving the confidence of the church. If these statements be true, do let us look at them, let us weigh them well, and if possible, put away the evil from us; if we do not, we may most surely expect to incur the displeasure of a righteous God. Our enemies are sometimes our most faithful reprovers, and we are accountable how we improve their admonitions. If these statements are exaggerated and coloured, then strip them of their exaggerations, rub off their colouring and look at the truth as it remains. But it is said that although these statements contain a great deal of truth, yet the enemies of religion are not capable of judging on the subject, and therefore they had better not be exposed, lest it give them occasion to reproach. By the same rule we might discard the Bible. Are the enemies of religion any more capable of judging of the conduct of Noah, Abraham, Lot, Sampson, David, Solomon, Peter, and even of the dissimulation of Paul? Yet this is exposed and recorded by the pen of inspiration. The enemies of religion will take the liberty of reading the Cries and of judging of them, whether *we* read them or not, and if we *connive* at this wickedness, they will take the liberty of judging us, (and not without some reason,) to be hypocrites. Our *connivance* at these evils will hurt the cause of Christ a thousand times more than a faithful exposition and correction of them will. *I* wish to let the world know that *I* do utterly *detest* and *abhor* any thing like intrigue, deceit, hypocrisy and even dissimulation, in religious matters. There can be no need of such means in support of truth, and error must be pulled down, therefore I would exhort every christian who regards the welfare of the church, faithfully, carefully and cordially to peruse the pages of the Cry, and if any thing appears therein, contrary to the truth, to expose it to public view; as this is the only effectual way of counteracting any injurious tendency which they may be thought to have. None were ever injured by believing too much *truth*, but multitudes have lost their souls for not believing enough.

I shall now take some notice of the charges and testimony against me not mentioned in the admonition.

I am charged with remarks concerning our Pastor's preaching and *conduct*, &c. But no evidence was called for in sup-

port of the last part of this charge, yet the committee dared to report, that they had with *very little examination*, found sufficient evidence to convince them beyond a *doubt*, that I was guilty on these charges. If they found evidence that I had made remarks on the Pastor's conduct, why was not this evidence brought forward? I cannot account for it on any other principle, than that of their being so conscious of the fact, that they feared the church could not be induced to condemn me on it, and thus a stain would remain on their Pastor's character.

On the 2d general charge, nothing was proved against me, and no witness was brought against me. Dea. Davis said that James Adams said, that I said that Mrs. Hunstable was a liar, or a hypocrite, and that I had told her so. To which I now reply that Mr. A. and myself had some conversation about this person, respecting a former church meeting held on her account, in the course of which I remarked, that I had given her to understand that *I should consider her* as a liar and a hypocrite, until three of the most credible members of our church should be proved to be liars. For the ground of this opinion, I refer to the result of a special church meeting, held on the 3d of July last, the particulars of which, it will not be proper for me to relate in this defence. Davis further states that he had charged me with saying that one member had been admitted to the church by one vote, &c. but I had denied first reporting this story, but had said to Dr. Bartlett that I had no reason to doubt its being a fact. To this, I say that twenty four members only were present at the meeting when this person was admitted, and that twelve of these had expressed their decided dissatisfaction with this person, and their great grief at the thought of his admittance to the church, and they had made it the subject of their prayers: therefore I could not reasonably expect those persons would vote for his admission. When he was admitted, I inquired how the votes stood, but was refused the information.

Davis further states that although I had made confession to him for *saying* that he was more anxious to get members into the church than he was to save souls, yet I had told him that it was my opinion that it was true, or something to that purpose. When Dea. Davis charged me with saying this, I could not recollect to whom I had ever said it, but I told him it had frequently been made the subject of conversation, and I thought it more than probable I had said it, and I confessed it to be wrong, and was very sorry for *saying* it abroad, but I faithfully told him that I had *too much reason* to fear it was true, or some-

thing to the same import. I would gladly have passed over this, had the Deacon been willing to let it rest here, but as he has brought it before the public, in justice to myself, I must give a few reasons for entertaining such an opinion, and this I will do in a manner as favorable to the Deacon as I can.

First, the Deacon has uniformly been an advocate for popularity in this society, which I conceive to be the bane of vital godliness.—Second, he has always been an advocate for superficial examinations, and has feared that thorough examinations would tend to keep persons back from uniting with the church.—Third, he has said that in a time of revival, the doctrines of the bible ought to be *kept back*, for they would have a tendency to frighten persons from the inquiry meetings.

On the third general charge, no evidence is brought to prove that the Cries are destitute of a name, or are anti-christian in their character, or libellous in any respects; neither has it been proved that I have circulated them after I was warned, &c.

On the fourth general charge, *nothing* has been proved, although the whole church were called upon to testify to the truth of it, and four men had been engaged for three days in raking up testimony against me. David Hartwell, it is true, has something to say on the subject, but what is the amount of it? why, Mr. Green and another person had said *enough*, but the other one was the worst. «Now if every person would stop talking when they had said *enough*, we should find much less contention in the world. There is not a word to show that either of us said *too much*, yet I did not say so much as the other person who was at this very meeting, and remains as yet, unmolested.

On the fifth charge, for conduct inconsistent with christian propriety, not a single specification, nor a single witness was produced. May I not ask *some* of this committee, what would probably be the result, if five men should start from their meet-house and spend *thirty minutes* in raking up accusations against the *propriety* of their christian conduct!

It now remains for me lastly, to justify myself for telling these truths abroad.

According to common usage I suppose I ought to have labored with the Pastor on the grounds of my dissatisfaction, and if I had not obtained satisfaction, *then* called on the church to assist me.

I did indeed labor with Mr. S. during his probation as a candidate, in order to ascertain his sentiments, and to be satisfied in regard to them. But here I acknowledge with shame and deep contrition that I afterwards acted in concert with the

church, contrary to my convictions in regard to Mr. S., being induced to do it, by those in whom I had improperly placed the most implicit confidence, and perhaps I did not explain to him in a manner sufficiently plain, the reasons for my acting thus, but be this as it may, several members who acted in a similar manner and for similar reasons with myself, did give Mr. S. plainly to understand what their feelings towards him were. In my conversation with him, I had plainly asked him if he believed with Baxter, and not receiving a direct answer, I plainly told him that this church would not quietly receive that doctrine. I further stated some of the views and proceedings of the *then* minority of the church, which he *seemingly* disapproved of very much. All this took place previous to his accepting a call to become our Pastor. After his ordination, it was plainly to be perceived, that he was palming liberal doctrine on us, and that he cordially approved of the views and proceedings of the minority above mentioned, and was using his exertions to build it up; yet no one dared to act, and nothing was done, but to weep in secret places until the corruption had spread to an alarming degree. True, Mr. S. had been conversed with, on the subject, by different individuals, but to no purpose. No measures had been taken to check the progress of this error, until some time in Sept. when it was ascertained that twenty-six members were more or less dissatisfied, and a paper was drawn up with a view to effect a reformation, and near a dozen names subscribed, when we were met by opposition, at the first shock of which, about ten who had expressed dissatisfaction, threw down their arms and went over to the enemy. At this time the subject was brought before the church, and the principal causes of grief were plainly stated. At length it was all smoothed up, and nothing decisive could be done. This desertion, so weakened the hands of what I shall call the church, (because they were the major part of those who were first organized,) and strengthened the hands of the enemy, that the hearts of the former, were greatly discouraged, and those of the latter elated, so that our sentiments and our exertions in the cause of truth were more openly and violently attacked. Something must be done, common usage was too inefficient; therefore after much deliberation, I resolved openly and boldly to express my opinion and declare these truths, in the hope that the church would be induced thereby to take up the subject and give it a thorough investigation, for I *did* believe that there was then piety enough in the church, not to suffer the further progress of such proceedings, if they would look at them with the

eye of discrimination, so as to perceive their tendency. With these views and motives, and under these circumstances, I have acted—the result is before you, from which you will plainly infer, that an *investigation* has been *dreaded* and *avoided*, and you will decide whether it has been avoided in justice or not.

My case is now before you in all its aggravations, except that of my poverty, which may be added.

You have seen enough of my views of truth to judge of my sentiments, and decide whether I am a heretic; you have heard all the testimony against me, and you have heard my defence, and I leave you to decide whether I am deserving of censure, of condemnation, or of expulsion from the church. And may God guide you in your judgment, sanctify your affections and fit you and me, through the riches of his grace in Christ Jesus, for an inheritance “where the wicked cease from troubling, and where the weary are at rest.”

JOSEPH C. GREEN.

APPENDIX.

A.—It may be desirable to some to know the origin and progress of this church—I would refer them to the “Cry from the Four Winds:”—particularly to a series of communications from a Hopkensian.

B.—I informed Mr Southmayd that I should plead the truth in defence, and I requested one week after the first meeting, to prepare for my defence. This he *said* he was willing to grant. The reader may judge of his sincerity.

C.—The reader is requested carefully to consider whether my request was unfair, and whether I was allowed a fair opportunity to defend myself.

D.—I was here accused of meddling with that which was not my business, yet no one doubted the propriety of David Hartwell's going to Carlisle to meddle with my business. During the whole trial, this man was so agitated that he walked the room and vented himself in frequent muttering, murmurings and exclamations.

E.—What right had the seamen to throw Jonah overboard?

F.—My quotations may not be correct in every particular, but they are substantially correct, for they are given from minutes taken at the time of their delivery.

It is reported that my case was tried in Boston, more than a month before it was in Concord; and I was condemned, and ordered to be cast out. This may account for something that was said in the last meeting, after I had retired, which resulted in my expulsion, by seventeen votes, about half of which were by females.

If any person should feel disposed to question the statements made in this defence, I can assure them that I can produce abundant testimony to substantiate them, whenever it shall be demanded in a legal way.

ERRATA.

Page 5, line 14 from top, after of, insert his.

“ 5, “ 6 from bottom, for re-receive, read receive.

“ 8, “ 20 from bottom, for dot, read do not.

“ 9, “ 12 from bottom, after judging, insert of.

“ 12, “ 3 from top, for charge, read charges.

“ 15, “ 8 from bottom, for plea, read plan.

“ 26, “ 17 from bottom, for revolution, read revelation.





(Dec., 1888, 20,000)

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY.

One volume allowed at a time, and obtained only by card; to be kept 14 days (or seven days in the case of fiction and juvenile books published within one year) without fine; not to be renewed; to be reclaimed by messenger after 21 days, who will collect 20 cents besides fine of 2 cents a day, including Sundays and holidays; not to be lent out of the borrower's household, and not to be transferred; to be returned at this Hall.

Borrowers finding this book mutilated or unwarrantably defaced, are expected to report it; and also any undue delay in the delivery of books.

* * No claim can be established because of the failure of any notice, to or from the Library, through the mail.

The record below must not be made or altered by borrower.

